

1 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
United States Attorney

2 PHILIP A. GUENTERT (CABN 147374)
3 Acting Chief, Criminal Division

4 HALLIE MITCHELL HOFFMAN (CABN 210020)
HARTLEY M. K. WEST (CABN 191609)
5 JEFF SCHENK (CABN 234355)

6 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102-3495
7 Telephone: (415) 436-7200
FAX: (415) 436-7234
8 hallie.hoffman@usdoj.gov
hartley.west@usdoj.gov
9 jeffrey.b.schenk@usdoj.gov

10 Attorneys for United States of America

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
14

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CASE NO. CR 14-00175 TEH
)	
16 Plaintiff,)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO
)	DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE
17 v.)	RUPTURE EVIDENCE, OR, ALTERNATIVELY,
)	TO SEVER COUNT ONE
18 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,)	
)	
19 Defendant.)	
)	

20
21 In this case about willful violation of federal pipeline safety regulations and obstruction of the
22 federal investigation following an explosion of one of its natural gas transmission pipelines in San
23 Bruno, PG&E makes a last ditch effort to keep the jury from hearing about the explosion. The Court
24 denied PG&E's motion to strike the explosion from the indictment, finding it relevant. Dkt. 43. Then
25 the Court denied PG&E's motion to exclude it from the trial, balancing the probative value against the
26 risk of unfair prejudice to conclude that the government could offer (1) evidence that there was a
27 "deadly explosion" and (2) a map depicting the plot lines of damaged and destroyed homes, without
28

U.S. OPP. TO DEFT'S MOT. TO EXCLUDE RUPTURE EVIDENCE
OR, ALTERNATIVELY, TO SEVER COUNT ONE
CR 14-00175 TEH

1 differentiating between the two. Dkt. 460 at 10-11. The government intends to comply with this order.

2 **A. The Witnesses**

3 The United States intends to call Scott Waldvogel. Waldvogel will testify that he is a firefighter
4 in the town of San Bruno; that he responded to the Crestmoor neighborhood of San Bruno on September
5 9, 2010; that there had been a deadly explosion; and that the map proffered by the government (and
6 previously-approved by this Court) fairly and accurately reflects the properties that were damaged as a
7 result of the explosion. That's it.

8 The Court's Order on motions in limine disallowed the government's previously-proffered
9 testimony from Waldvogel, regarding the fire itself. Accordingly, in its Amended Witness List, the
10 government identified an alternate to Waldvogel – San Bruno Mayor James Ruane – to provide the
11 above testimony. Because the Court confirmed last week that its order pertained to the substance of
12 proffered testimony, and was not excluding Waldvogel from testifying as to areas that the Court
13 permitted, the government intends to call Waldvogel and not Mayor Ruane.

14 Miranda Martin is a records custodian for the San Mateo County Assessor's Office. She
15 certified the plot maps of the Crestmoor neighborhood. She is listed as a witness in case PG&E fights
16 the underlying map, despite its certification of authenticity. She has no personal knowledge of, and thus
17 no ability to authenticate, the map depicting damaged and destroyed homes.

18 The government should be permitted to use its preferred witness to prove the facts that this Court
19 held admissible. The Court should deny PG&E's motion to exclude Waldvogel. If Waldvogel is
20 excluded, the Court should allow the government to call Mayor Ruane.

21 **B. The Map**

22 The Court has held that the map is admissible. PG&E does not dispute its accuracy. Dkt. 640 at
23 2:25-26. The government requests permission to use it in its Opening Statement.

24 **C. Severance**

25 The Court should deny PG&E's motion to sever Count One. Counts are properly joined if the
26 offenses "are of the same or similar character, or are based on the same act or transaction, or are
27 connected with or constitute parts of a common scheme or plan." Fed. R. Crim. P. 8(a). A trial court's
28

1 discretion not to sever counts will not be disturbed unless “a joint trial was so manifestly prejudicial as
2 to require the trial judge to exercise his discretion in but one way, by ordering a separate trial.” *United*
3 *States v. Mohsen*, 587 F.3d 1028, 1031 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also United States v. Lewis*, 787 F.2d 1318,
4 1321 (9th Cir.1986) (“The prejudice must have been of such magnitude that the defendant's right to a
5 fair trial was abridged.”). The risks of unfair prejudice have been resolved by this Court’s extremely
6 thorough and stringent rulings on defendant’s motions in limine.

7 Moreover, for the reasons set forth in this Court’s prior orders, the explosion is relevant and
8 admissible as to all of the Pipeline Safety Act counts, as well as the obstruction count. Judicial economy
9 strongly favors joinder. *See United States v. Lopez*, 477 F.3d 1110, 1116 (9th Cir. 2007) (“concerns of
10 judicial economy strongly supported the denial of the motion to sever in this case”).
11

12 DATED: June 13, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

13 BRIAN J. STRETCH
14 United States Attorney

15 /s/
HARTLEY M. K. WEST
16 Assistant United States Attorney
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28